Application No. Applicant(s) 09/942,336 ASHIZAWA ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Shar Hashemi 1637 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Shar Hashemi. (2) Melissa L. Sistrunk. Date of Interview: 20 June 2002. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1-28. Identification of prior art discussed: No. Agreement with respect to the claims f(x) was reached. f(x) was not reached. f(x) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Groupl, claims 1-17. . (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/942,336		ASHIZAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	-	Art Unit	
	Shar Hashemi		1637	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) <u>Shar Hashemi</u> .	(3) Jeffrey Siew.			
(2) Melissa L. Sistrunk.	(4)			
Date of Interview: 20 June 2002.				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.			
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-28</u> .				
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>No</u> .				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The first telephonic interview occurred on June 20, 2002, where a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-17. On September 4, 2002 at 1:00 pm, the second telephonic interview, Examiners Siew and Hashemi discussed items A and B on page 5 of the FAOM. Item B was "withdrawn" by Examiner Siew. Also, a possible amenedment to overcome the rejection was discussed.				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached	opy of the amendme	aminer agr ents that w	eed would rende ould render the	er the claims claims
 i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se checked). 	parate record of the	e substance	e of the interviev	v(if box is
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORI MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW reverse side or on attached sheet.	(See MPEP Section MONTH FROM TH	on 713.04). IS INTERV	If a reply to the	e last Office
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	 Exami	ner's signa	ture, if required	